

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13, and 23-33 were pending. By this amendment claims 1 and 26 are amended. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter is added. As a result, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13, and 23-33 remain pending and at issue.

The applicants thank the examiner for the allowance of claims 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13, 31, and 33.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 23-30, and 32 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. D341,377 to Ringle ("Ringle") in view of one or more of U.S. Patent No. D328,103 to Ambasz ("Ambasz"); U.S. Patent No. 4,844,264 to Deskiewicz ("Deskiewicz"); U.S. Patent Application No. D158,444 to Converse ("Converse"); and U.S. Patent No D366,170 to Temple ("Temple"). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2143. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest all claim limitations. Each of claims 1, 23-30, and 32 now recites an apparatus for organizing a desktop comprising, in part, a support wall extending downward from the base and a bottom edge of the support wall that is not parallel to the base.

Neither Ringle nor Ambasz disclose or suggest a support wall of any sort extending downward from the base. *See* the figures of both Ringle and Ambasz. Thus, Ringle and Ambasz fail to disclose or suggest a support wall extending downward from the base and a bottom edge of the support wall that is not parallel to the base.

While Deskiewicz discloses a tray and stand combination, the tray does not have a support wall of any sort extending downward from the base. *See* Fig. 2 of Deskiewicz. Rather, the tray portion 12 includes left, right, front and back walls 14, 16, 18, 20, all extending upward from the bottom 22. Thus, Deskiewicz fails to disclose or suggest a support wall extending downward from the base and a bottom edge of the support wall that is not parallel to the base

While Converse discloses a letter tray with a downward extending front wall, the bottom edge of the front wall is parallel to the base. *See* Figs 1 and 4 of Converse. Thus,

Converse fails to disclose or suggest a support wall extending downward from the base and a bottom edge of the support wall that is not parallel to the base.

Similarly, Temple discloses a tray table having a downward extending front wall. However, the bottom edge of the front wall is parallel to the base. *See Fig. 4 of Temple.* Thus, Temple fails to disclose or suggest a support wall extending downward from the base and a bottom edge of the support wall that is not parallel to the base.

Because the cited art fails to disclose or suggest a support wall extending downward from the base and a bottom edge of the support wall that is not parallel to the base, as is recited by each of claims 1, 23-30, and 32, none of claims 1, 23-30, and 32 can be rendered obvious by any combination of the cited art. Thus, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 23-30, and 32.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the claims as now appearing in this application are in proper form for allowance. If, in the opinion of the examiner a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29618/38938.

Dated: June 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael A. Chinlund

Registration No.: 55,064

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Agent for Applicants